

Equal Rights

VOL. XX, No. 9
FIVE CENTS

SATURDAY
MARCH 31, 1934



Confer on Civil and Political Rights of Women

The first meeting of the Third Commission of the Seventh International Conference of American States at Montevideo which dealt with the Report of the Inter American Commission of Women on the Civil and Political Rights of Women.

Around the table can be seen (left to right): Dr. Sophonisba Breckenridge, United States Delegate to the Conference and Alternate on the Third Commission; Alexander W. Weddell, United States Ambassador to the Argentine, Delegate and United States representative on the Third Commission; Dr. Francisco Luis da Silva Campos, Brazilian Delegate and his country's representative on the Third Commission; Bertha Lutz, Technical Adviser on the Brazilian Delegation; Margarita Robles de Mendoza, Technical Adviser on the Mexican Delegation; Dr. Sofia V. de Demicheli, Delegate for Uruguay and member of the Third Commission. All countries with the exception of Honduras were represented on the Third Commission.

Equal Rights



OFFICIAL ORGAN
of the
National Woman's Party
Capitol Hill,
Washington, D. C.
Phone, Atlantic 1210
Published Weekly
at 19 West Chase Street,
Baltimore, Md.
Phone, Vernon 3279

Edith Houghton Hooker Editor
Emilie A. Doetsch Managing Editor
Dora G. Ogle Business Manager

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

Nina E. Allender	Ada Davenport Kendall
Zoe Beckley	Muna Lee
Ruby A. Black	Alma Lutz
Lucia Chamberlain	Hazel MacKaye
Phyllis Duganne	Edna St. Vincent Millay
Ernestine Evans	Ruth Pickering
Rose Feld	Alice Rohe
Zona Gale	Maryse Rutledge
Helen Davenport Gibbons	Miriam Finn Scott
Rebecca Hourwich	Doris Stevens
Ruth Hale	Sophie Treadwell
Inez Haynes Irwin	Brenda Ueland
	Mary Winsor

Entered as second-class matter at Postoffice,
Baltimore, Md., under Act March 3, 1879.

Subscription, \$2.00 a Year

Foreign Subscription, \$2.50

OFFICERS OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

Chairman National Council, Sarah T. Colvin,
1175 Davern Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Vice-Chairmen,

Florence Bayard Hilles, Del.

Gail Laughlin, Me.

Anita Pollitzer, S. C.

Secretary, Rebekah Greathouse, D. C.

Treasurer, Laura Berrien, D. C.

Congressional Chairman, Maud Younger, Cal.

Parliamentarian, Emma A. Fox, Mich.

Edwina Austin Avery, D. C.

Nina E. Allender, D. C.

Mrs. Dwight Clark, D. C.

Mrs. Merritt O. Chance, D. C.

Bertha W. Fowler, Colo.

Elsie Hill, Conn.

Inez Haynes Irwin, N. Y.

Edith Houghton Hooker, Md.

Elizabeth T. Kent, Calif.

Alma Lutz, N. Dak.

Burnita S. Matthews, Miss.

Lola Maverick Lloyd, Ill.

Mary A. Murray, N. Y.

Dora G. Ogle, Md.

Alice Paul, N. J.

Elizabeth Selden Rogers, N.Y.

Jane Norman Smith, N. Y.

A. Marguerite Smith, Mass.

Doris Stevens, N. Y.

Mrs. John Jay White, N. Y.

Margaret Whittemore, Calif.

Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, D. C.

Mrs. Valentine Winters, Ohio

Maud Younger, Calif.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

Annual Dues	\$10.00
Associate Members	\$1.00
Subscribing Members	\$3.00
Founders	\$100.00
Life Members	\$1,000.00
Endowers	\$5,000.00
Sustainers	\$5,000.00

OBJECT OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

The object of this organization shall be to secure for women complete equality with men under the law and in all human relationships.

THE LUCRETIA MOTT AMENDMENT

"Men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction."

"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

[Senate Joint Resolution Number 1]
[House Joint Resolution Number 1]

Introduced in the Senate March 10, 1933,
by SENATOR JOHN G. TOWNSEND, Delaware.

Introduced in the House March 9, 1933,
by REPRESENTATIVE LOUIS LUDLOW, Indiana.

Into Macedonia

AMONG the most zealous workers in the National Woman's Party is Dr. Mary Wilhelmina Williams of Baltimore, professor of history at Goucher College.

Much of the credit for the organization of the flourishing Goucher College Student Council is due to inspiration and encouragement received by the students who constitute its membership from Dr. Williams.

The Council and its activities have received official recognition of the College authorities with which is accorded the privilege of holding meetings on the College campus.

From Goucher and Baltimore, Dr. Williams looked out for wider fields to conquer. Her latest undertaking is the writing of letters to personal friends in the history departments of other colleges and universities in which she explains the work, aims and purposes of the Woman's Party and urges them to become members.

This is missionary work of the finest kind. Teachers more than any other class, with the possible exception of writers, are moulders of public opinion. Their influence may be even stronger than that of the writers, because they help to mould the minds and characters of youth, and because impressions made at that time are the deepest and most lasting.

Furthermore, when questioned about her plan the other day, Dr. Williams expressed the hope that other members in the Party, not necessarily or exclusively teachers, would take the cue from her and write letters to their friends, urging them to join the Party and also to subscribe to EQUAL RIGHTS. What wonderful results could be achieved through such personal appeals especially for this magazine, whose subscription list should be ten times its present number!

We congratulate Dr. Williams on her brilliant idea and the Party in having this wonderful friend.

The New Peonage

WE like to believe that human slavery in the United States was wiped out by the Civil War. In fact, we should hotly resent it if a citizen of another country dared raise the question as to whether all Americans were, in fact, free and equal.

That there is an excellent basis for doubt on the subject, can be seen from statements made by speakers who attended the recent "Discussion Luncheon" arranged by the New York City Committee of the Woman's Party, an account of which appears in this issue.

A slave, or peon, or apprentice—the last-mentioned word being used in the old sense of being "bound out" to serve a master—is one who must take what he can get in exchange for oppressive toil. The slave, as a rule, received no wages. The peon was kept in virtual servitude until he had paid off a debt he owed his master. The apprentice in the old days had to submit to arbitrary conditions prescribed alone by the master.

Sentiment does not enter into the fixing of wage scales; the determining factors are hard, uncompromising facts and figures revealed in financial statements. If, therefore, a worker receives a stated amount per hour, it must be taken for granted that he is worth every penny he earns. Standing next to him, however, in the factory is a woman who does identically the same work at the same speed and of the same standard of excellence, who receives 10 cents less an hour, or \$4.80 cents per week of six 8-hour days.

Or there is a job available in a printer's shop worth from \$75 to \$100 a week, but it is a night job, and a New York statute forbids the employment of women after 10 P. M. A woman applicant, even if she were a better printer than a man rival for the same job, could not get it.

The accident of birth can therefore be one of the most serious catastrophes that can befall a human being, because it may strike at a right which means liberty or servitude—the right to contract on a free and equal basis with all other workers in the same class. And this right is denied, in the NRA codes, by a government founded on a document of liberty which proclaims all men to be "free and equal."

Even the peon had less cause to complain. There was a reason for his slavery. He had incurred a debt to his employer which he paid off in toil. In feudal times there were peons in England, but the yoke was cast off with the signing of Magna Charta. American women are large taxpayers, they spend 80 per cent of the nation's wealth, presumably they are citizens; but many of them, when it comes to jobs, are economic slaves.

Code Discriminations Against Women

THE statement of the President on January 3 that the industrial provisions of the codes of the National Recovery Administration are indicative of a permanent set-up, make it necessary to examine more critically than heretofore the standing of the woman industrial worker under the New Deal.

Numerous discriminations against her are already written into the approved codes. When the special revisions scheduled for this month (March) take place, women will expect to see changes made in the interests of equal opportunity for women workers and the removal of limitations which militate against them.

The following tables show unequal pro-

By Clara Snell Wolfe
Officer, Ohio Branch, National Woman's Party

visions in force in codes already approved up to January 23. The discriminations as to hours pertain mostly to night work. Night work is forbidden to women in the following industries:

Cement:

Females shall not be employed after 6 P. M. Throwing (a textile industry):

Males only may be employed on night shifts. Paper Stationery and Tablet Manufacturing:

Female factory employees shall not be permitted to work from 7 P. M. to 7 A. M.

Sanitary Napkin and Cleansing Tissue:

No female employee shall be required or permitted to work between 8 P. M. and 6 A. M.

In all but the first of these four indus-

tries, as will be seen in a later table, women are also paid a lower minimum wage for day work than are men, thus allowing a double discrimination in the same industry. In the Throwing Industry higher wages are paid for night work, in which women are not allowed to take part, than for day work, the differential being ten cents per hour.

In the Powder-Puff Industry, males over 18 years of age engaged in cutting materials are permitted to work 100 hours extra per year. For this overtime work they are paid at one and one-third times the normal rate.

Discriminations in wages are definitely established in the following codes:

Industry	Craft	Minimum Wage Males Females Per Hour		Industry	Craft	Average Minimum Wage Males Females	
Coat and Suit (Eastern area, New York and Philadelphia)	Jacket, Coat, Reefer and Dress Operators	\$1.00	\$.90	Jacket, Coat, Reefer and Dress Operators		\$1.26	\$.95
	Skirt Operators	.90	.80		Skirt Operators	1.15	.90
(Eastern area, outside New York and Philadelphia)	Jacket, Coat, Reefer and Dress Operators	.90	.81	Jacket, Coat and Reefer Finishers		1.10	.84
	Skirt Operators	.81	.72		Jacket, Coat, Reefer and Dress Upper Pressers	1.26	
(Western area)	Jacket, Coat, Reefer and Dress Operators	.85	.75	Jacket, Coat, Reefer and Dress Under Pressers		1.15	
	Skirt Operators	.75	.70		Jacket, Coat, Reefer and Dress Part Pressers	.92	
	Jacket, Coat, Reefer and Dress Upper Pressers	.85		Lining Ironers			.82
	Jacket, Coat, Reefer and Dress Under Pressers	.77			Jacket, Coat, Reefer and Dress Finishers		.84
	Jacket, Coat, Reefer and Part Pressers	.65	.47	Jacket, Coat, Reefer, Skirt Buttonsewers			.70
	Jacket, Coat, Reefer Finishers	.75			(Under 18)	.45	.35
	Apprentices	.60		Rayon and Silk Dyeing and Printing		.38	
	Lining Ironers		.60		Wall Paper Manufacturing	.35	.32½
	Jacket, Coat, Reefer and Dress Finishers		.63				
	Jacket, Coat, Reefer, Skirt Button-sewers		.53				

Three codes leave the status of the woman worker in doubt, as they use the general term "employee", "worker", or "labor" for the statement of the minimum wage, but specify lower minimum rates for women engaged in certain processes. Whether they are permitted to work at other processes at the higher rate is not clear. These codes are Automobile Manufacturing, Hardwood Distillation and Saddlery Manufacturing. In the first, the minimum wage is 40-43 cents an hour, according to population of the cities where the worker is employed, with the provision that "Apprentices, and learners and females not doing the same work as adult males" shall be paid not less than 35-37% cents per hour, but the number of such apprentices and learners and females not doing the same work as adult males employed by any employer shall not exceed five per cent of the total number of factory employees of such employer.

In the Hardwood Distillation Industry, the minimum hourly wage paid to employees is 30 cents per hour in the North

and 25 cents per hour in the South, except the following, whose minimum wages per hour are 24 cents in the North and 20 cents in the South:

(a) Males between 16 and 18 years of age when the lack of the income would work a hardship on their dependents;

(b) In the Southern Division females employed for packing charcoal in paper bags;

(c) Those physically handicapped. These exceptions may not total more than eight per cent of the total number in any one plant.

In the Saddlery Manufacturing Industry, the minimum is 35 cents in the North and 32½ cents in the South, except for women making pads and cotton harness products, where the minimum is two and one-half cents lower.

Perhaps the greatest danger of injustice to the woman worker lies in the numerous codes which specify a lower minimum wage for women and add some such qualifying clause as, "Female employees

employed in the same type of work as male employees shall receive the same wage per hour as paid to male employees," or, "The foregoing minimum rates are not a discrimination by reason of sex but because of difference in the work of the industry. Where women do the same kind and amount of work as men they shall receive the same wages." The danger of such a clause lies in the false sense of security in equality which it may give. While the definite differential remains between the rate for men's work and the rate for women's work, it offers but a slight guarantee, namely, that if no men are available for a certain process, and women "replace" men, they shall receive the same wage as men receive. There is nothing in these codes, in spite of the equal-pay-for-equal-work clause which they contain, to prevent an employer from employing women only in the lower paid processes. Such provisions in many cases appear merely to ratify discriminations made in the past. There are 43 such codes:

Industry		Wages per hour		Industry		Wages per hour	
		Males	Females			Males	Females
Advertising Specialty Manufacturing		35c	30c	Gas Cook		40	33
American Match		38	30	Grinding Wheel		40	35-40
Anti-Friction Bearing		40	35	Leather	North	40	35
Asbestos	North	40	35		South	32-1/2	32-1/2
	South	37-1/2	32-1/2	Linoleum and Felt Base Manufacturing		40	35
Asphalt Shingle and Roofing	Pacific Coast	45	35	Musical Merchandise Manufacturing		35	32
	North	40	35	Non-Ferrous Foundry	North	40	35
	South	37-1/2	35		South	30	27
Automotive Parts and Equipment Manufacturing	North	35-40	30 3/4-35	Office Equipment Manufacturing		35-40	30-35
	South	28	24-1/2	Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Manufacturing		40	35
Boot and Shoe Manufacturing	North	35-37-1/2	30-32-1/2	Paper and Pulp	North	38	33
	South	35	30		Central	35	30
Business Furniture, Storage Equipment, and Filing Supply		40	35-40		South	30	30
Chinaware and Porcelain Manufacturing		40	32	Paper Stationery and Tablet Manufacturing	North	38	33
Coated Abrasives		40	35		South	30	30
Copper and Brass Mill Products		35-40	30-35	Paperboard	North	38	33
Cork		38	30		Central	35	30
Crown Manufacturing		40	35		South	30	30
Excelsior and Excelsior Products	North	30	25	Piano Manufacturing		40	32
	South	22-1/2	20	Plumbing Fixtures	North	40	35
Fabricated Metal Products Manufacturing and Metal Finishing and Metal Coating	North	40	35		South	35	35
	South	35	30	Pyrotechnic Manufacturing		37-1/2-40	32-1/2-40
Farm Equipment		30-40	25-35	Railway Safety Appliance		40	35
Floor and Wall Clay Tile Manufacturing		40	32-1/2	Salt Producing	North	35	32
Folding Paper Box	North	40	35		South	30	25
	South	35	30	Sanitary Napkin and Cleansing Tissue		41-3/4	33-1/2
Funeral Supply	North	40	30	Set Up Paper Box Manufacturing	North	37-1/2	32-1/2
	South	30	30		South	32-1/2	30
Fur Dressing and Fur Dyeing	19 yrs.+	50-65	35-45	Shoe and Leather Finish, Polish and Cement Manufacturing		37-1/2-40	32-1/2-35
	16-19 yrs.	35-45			North	40	36
Gas Appliances and Apparatus	North	40	35	Valve and Fittings Manufacturing	South	32	30
	South	32-35	27-30	Washing and Ironing Machine Manufacturing		40	36
				Wax Paper	North	40	35
					South	35	30

Almost all the codes carry a provision that, when the State requires a higher minimum wage rate, such rate prevails over that prescribed by the code. Whether this provision is written into the code or not, the State law prevails in those States that have a minimum wage law for women. This complicates the situation considerably for women workers who find themselves in competition with men.

In addition to the above discriminations in the approved codes—discriminations which appear in approximately one-fourth of their total number up to January 23—there remain the inequalities in the hundreds of temporary codes.

These latter codes, while temporary, are remaining in effect indefinitely. Before they are approved, they should in all justice be revised and discriminations against women removed.

There are several codes which offer a model for this revision in their statement as to minimum rates of pay and maximum hours of work. The Motion Picture Industry, for example, says, "No employee shall work more than forty hours in any one week." There are reasonable exceptions to this, such as executives, managers, emergency repair workers, etc., but in all cases hours are determined by

the nature of the work and not by the sex of the worker. As to wages, the same code says, "No employee of any class shall be paid less than 40 cents per hour. The following clerical, office and service employees shall be paid not less than 50 cents per hour." (Rates for 15 such groups are specified.) Thus the work is classified and minimum wages are provided for each class of worker. Adult women are classed with adult men in the industry, not with children, apprentices and the handicapped in general. So far as the code states, no worker is debarred from any kind of work, even the highest paid, because of sex.

"Ask Any Working Girl for the Answer"

LIVELY discussion and interesting speeches marked the success of the Discussion Luncheon given by the New York City Committee, National Woman's Party, March 22, at the Studio Club, 210 East 77th street, New York City. Guests and members of the Industrial and Government Workers' Councils participated in the discussion.

Helen Christine Bennett, Feminist, magazine writer of note and self-styled propagandist for women's rights, spoke on the position of women under the NRA. Miss Bennett has made a thorough research into the economic status of women, at home and abroad, and has recently completed an article on woman's NRA status which will appear in a forthcoming issue of *Liberty*. Cleverly and humorously Miss Bennett pointed out the inferior position into which women had been thrust by lower NRA wage scales.

"Of more than 200 codes scrutinized," she said, "but one—that of fish net

weavers—fails to mention male or female in its pay schedule. Code after code establishes two sets of wage scales, one for men and another for women. Men are receiving, by governmental sanction, from 2 1/2c to 10c an hour more than women for the same services performed under identical working conditions. If you don't think that amounts to anything, just ask any working girl for the answer."

Miss Bennett concluded her remarks with a fervent plea for women to stand together, make their demands known to the world, and refuse to allow themselves to be placed in this position which marks them "inferior."

Maude Williams, a member of Typographical Union No. 6, and of the Industrial Council, National Woman's Party, long an opponent of special labor laws for women, was the next speaker. She told of the threatened menace to women of several provisions of the "Proposed Uniform Labor Legislation" recom-

mended by State Labor Representatives at a conference recently called by the United States Department of Labor.

"We workers thought," stated Mrs. Williams, "that under such a nice sounding title great benefits were in store for all workers—men and women alike—but on looking over this proposed code, what do we find?"

"Under the heading 'Hours of Labor' appears the recommendation for the abolition of night work for women. To many, unfamiliar with these regulations, that may seem a benefit to working women, but to those of us who have suffered from special labor laws for women it is most ominous. Let me cite a case in point. A woman printer who had for many, many months been struggling along on one or two nights' work a week on newspapers heard of a full-time job in a job shop. The pay would have been \$75 to \$100 a week. Upon application she found the work was at night. Could she

take this? Not for a moment. Despite her qualifications the job was closed to her by law. The laws of New York specify that no female may be employed after 10 P. M. and before 7 A. M. in certain industries. (Newspapers, however, have secured exemptions from these provisions.) And this woman is the sole support of her family. If the abolition of night work for women is made uniform throughout these United States, there will be thousands more of just such cases.

"The enactment of special labor regulations for women," Mrs. Williams continued, "invariably deprives women of employment or drives them to inferior positions with far less pay. And today, even domestic service, once considered only women's work, is being sought by unemployed men and boys."

Adelaide Stedman, former national organizer for the Woman's Party, who presided, urged those present not to take for granted that they had gained all the rights they should have, for even in our nationality laws, for which we have worked so long and so hard, there still remain discriminations against women. A

mother may not transmit her nationality to her minor child if the father is an alien. "The Copeland-Dickstein equal nationality bill would remove the last traces of inequality in our nationality laws," Miss Stedman said, "so see to it that your Representatives in Congress get behind that bill and have it passed without delay at this session."

Pursuing the subject of labor legislation for women, Jane Norman Smith, member of the National Council of the Woman's Party, graphically presented the picture from the international viewpoint. "These discriminatory laws are not alone products of our own country," she remarked, "but are closing in around women the whole world over." Mrs. Smith then outlined briefly the history of the International Labor Office of the League of Nations and spoke of the subjects on the agenda of the I. L. O. conference to be held this year. "It is most essential," Mrs. Smith concluded, "in order to be of greater help in our international work, that the Equal Rights Amendment be added promptly to our Federal Constitution."

Frances Phair, Secretary of the New

York Workers' Council, told of the provisions of Clause 213 of the Economy Act, its effect upon married women in government service, and efforts towards repeal of this Act made by the Woman's Party.

The following resolution was read and adopted at the meeting:

WHEREAS, the Copeland-Dickstein equal nationality bill would remove the last traces of inequality in our nationality laws and would grant an American mother the same right now possessed by an American father to transmit nationality to a child.

Therefore be it resolved, that this meeting of more than sixty women in business and in the professions, held at 210 East 77th street, New York City, urge Hon. John J. O'Connor, member from New York of the Rules Committee, House of Representatives, and Hon. Samuel Dickstein, sponsor of the bill in the House, and Hon. Royal S. Copeland, sponsor of the bill in the Senate, to work for an early vote, and the passage at this session of Congress of the Copeland-Dickstein equal nationality bill.

Be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be sent to Hon. John J. O'Connor, Hon. Samuel Dickstein and Hon. Royal S. Copeland.

Information on the Equal Nationality Treaty

1. *Text of the Equal Nationality Treaty.* The Nationality Treaty adopted at Montevideo reads as follows:

The Governments represented in the Seventh International Conference of American States,

Wishing to conclude a Convention on Nationality, have appointed the following Plenipotentiaries:

(Here follow all the countries with their plenipotentiaries.)

Who, after having exhibited their Full Powers, which were found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following:

ARTICLE 1—There will no distinction based on sex as regards nationality in their legislation or in their practice.

ARTICLE 2—The present convention shall be ratified by the High Contracting Parties in conformity with their respective constitutional procedure. The Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Uruguay shall transmit authentic certified copies to the governments for the aforementioned purpose of ratification. The instrument of ratification shall be deposited in the archives of the Pan American Union in Washington, which shall notify the signatory governments of said deposit. Such notification shall be considered as an exchange of ratifications.

ARTICLE 3—The present convention will enter into force between the High Contracting Parties in the order in which they deposit their respective ratifications.

Adopted at the Seventh Conference of American States at Montevideo, Uruguay, December 16, 1933.

ARTICLE 4—The present convention shall remain in force indefinitely, but may be denounced by means of a year's notice given to the Pan American Union, which shall transmit it to the other signatory Governments. After the expiration of this period, the convention shall cease in its effects as regards the party which denounces, but shall remain in effect for the remaining High Contracting Parties.

ARTICLE 5—The present convention shall be open for the adherence and accession of the States which are not signatories. The corresponding instruments shall be deposited in the archives of the Pan American Union which shall communicate them to the other High Contracting Parties.

In witness whereof the following plenipotentiaries have signed this convention in Spanish, English, Portuguese and French and hereunto fix their respective seals in the City of Montevideo, Republic of Uruguay, this twenty-sixth day of December, 1933.

Honduras—The delegation of Honduras adheres to the convention of equality of Nationality with the reservations and limitations which the Constitution and laws of our country determine.

United States—The delegation of the United States of America in signing the

Convention on the Nationality of Women makes the reservation that the agreement on the part of the United States is, of course and of necessity, subject to Congressional action.

El Salvador—Reservation to the effect that in El Salvador the Convention cannot be the object of immediate ratification, but that it will be necessary to consider previously the desirability of reforming the existing Naturalization Law, ratification being obtained only in the event that such legislative reform is undertaken, and after it may have been effected.

2. *Action on Equal Nationality Treaty by Seventh Conference of American Republics at Montevideo, December, 1933.*

Introduction of Treaty—The Treaty in the exact form in which it had been presented at The Hague Codification Conference and at the League of Nations Assembly, was laid before the Conference of American Republics at Montevideo by the Inter American Commission of Women. The Conference referred the Treaty to the Third Commission and the Third Commission referred it to a Sub-Committee.

Vote on Treaty by Sub-Committee of Third Commission—The Sub-Committee, composed of Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Mexico, Peru and Uruguay, voted unanimously to recommend the adoption of the Treaty by the Conference. This report was submitted to the Third Commission on December 16.

Vote on Treaty by Third Commission of Conference—The Third Commission voted on December 16 to report the Treaty favorably to the Conference. Sixteen countries voted for the favorable report. They were Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Haiti, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Paraguay, El Salvador, Uruguay and Venezuela. Two countries abstained from voting: Nicaragua and the United States. One country, Guatemala, did not vote because it was in the chair. Honduras was not on the Commission. The remaining Latin-American country, Costa Rica, was not a member of the Conference.

Vote on Treaty by Full Conference—The full Conference voted on December 16 to accept the Committee report recommending the adoption of the Treaty, the United States still being opposed.

Signing of Treaty—Secretary of State Hull announced, December 20th, at Montevideo that, acting upon instructions from President Roosevelt, the United States would sign the Treaty. The remaining Latin-American countries, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua, which had not made any declaration with regard to signing, then announced that they also would sign. Costa Rica announced that although not represented at the Conference, it would join in the Treaty. The acceptance of the Treaty by the 21 American republics thereupon became unanimous.

3. History of the Equal Nationality Treaty prior to the Montevideo Conference.

Hague Codification Conference—March-April, 1930—The Treaty was laid before the Hague Conference for the Codification of International Law in 1930 by Dr. Miguel Cruchaga of the Chilean delegation, at the request of the Inter American Commission of Women. The Treaty was supported at the Conference by the Chilean delegation. It did not receive the support of any other delegation.

League of Nations Assembly—September, 1931—The Treaty was laid before the League of Nations Assembly in September, 1931, by the Women's Consultative Committee on Nationality, a committee that had been set up in January, 1931, by the Council of the League, at the request of the governments of Guatemala, Venezuela and Peru, to advise the League upon matters relating to the nationality of women. The Chilean delegation supported the Treaty in the 1931 Assembly, as at The Hague Codification Conference the preceding year, but no other government gave its support at this Assembly.

League of Nations Assembly—September, 1932—Chile and Colombia proposed the Treaty to the League of Nations Assembly in September, 1932. China and Turkey seconded the proposal. The Treaty was also supported by Cuba, Guatemala,

Mexico and Panama. The other Latin-American delegations present announced their readiness to support the Treaty if it should emerge from Committee. The Treaty was opposed by a number of European delegations and by Canada, and was not acted upon by the Assembly.

League of Nations Assembly—September, 1933—The proposal of an Equal Nationality Treaty was laid before the 1933 Assembly by Chile and the proposal was supported by the Latin-American delegations present. No action was taken owing to the opposition of leading European delegations.

4. Support Given to the Equal Nationality Treaty by Jurists, Prior to the Montevideo Conference.

The Treaty, substantially in the form in which it was adopted at Montevideo, was twice approved, prior to the Montevideo Conference, by the principal juridical association of the Western Hemisphere, the American Institute of International Law, through its Governing Board. This Board unanimously adopted a resolution endorsing the Treaty at a meeting at Havana, October 29, 1929, and at a meeting at Washington, October 29-31, 1931. The resolution adopted at the latter meeting read:

"WHEREAS, the subject of nationality is on the proposed agenda of the Seventh International Conference of American States, and,

"WHEREAS, the Governing Board has already at its meeting in Havana on October 31, 1929, declared unanimously its approval of the following draft article on nationality:

"The Contracting States agree that from the going into effect of this treaty, there shall be no distinction based on sex in their law and practice relating to nationality."

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, this 31st day of October, 1931, that the Governing Board of the American Institute of International Law reaffirm its approval of the article in question, and recommend that it form an article in any convention submitted to the Seventh Conference for adoption, or, if no such convention is submitted, that it form a separate convention to be adopted by that conference."

5. Support Given to the Equal Nationality Treaty by International Women's Organizations Prior to the Montevideo Conference.

Prior to the Montevideo Conference, the Treaty had received world-wide support from international women's organizations, through its endorsement by the Women's Consultative Committee on Nationality created by the League of Nations. This Committee, composed of leading international Feminist organizations and representing women's organizations in forty-two countries with a combined membership of approximately forty-five million women, endorsed the Treaty in 1931, in its report to the League of Nations Assembly, as follows:

"This Committee wishes to express its support of the proposal put before The Hague Codification Conference by the delegation from Chile for a world agreement on nationality, reading:

"The contracting States agree that, from the going into effect of this Convention there shall be no distinction based on sex in their law and practice relating to nationality."

The report containing this endorsement was signed by the International Council of Women, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the Inter American Commission of Women, the Equal Rights International, the World Union of Women for Peace and Concord, the All-Asian Conference of Women, the International Alliance of Women for Suffrage and Equal Citizenship and the International Federation of University Women.

The Women's Consultative Committee on Nationality again gave its support to the Equal Nationality Treaty in a report prepared for the 1933 Assembly of the League, reading:

"We urge the Assembly to take the only effective step for the solution of this problem, namely, to frame and present to the Governments a new nationality convention on the lines of that proposed by the representative of Chile at The Hague Conference of 1930, reading:

"The contracting States agree that from the going into effect of this Convention there shall be no distinction based on sex in their law and practice relating to nationality."

This recommendation was signed by all of the organizations present at the meeting of the Women's Consultative Committee at which the report was adopted. They were: The International Council of Women, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the Inter American Commission of Women, the Equal Rights International and the All-Asian Conference of Women.

6. Support Given to Equal Nationality Treaty by Women's Organizations in the United States.

Messages urging the United States delegation to support the Equal Nationality Treaty at Montevideo were sent to Secretary Hull or to President Roosevelt by the following national organizations:

National Association of Women in Aviation, National Council of Women, National Association of Women for Equal Opportunity, National Council of Jewish Women, National Association of Women Lawyers, National Women's Medical Association, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (U. S. A. Section), National Association of Women Real Estate Operators, International Soroptimists' Club, National Woman's Party, International Zonta Clubs.

Similar messages were sent by many State and local organizations. Among the latter were:

Brooklyn Women's Rapid Transit Organization, Colorado Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Colorado National Woman's Party, Association of University Women of Colorado Springs, Women's International League of Colorado Springs, Columbus (Ohio) Federation of Women's Clubs, Delaware Business and Professional Women's Clubs, District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs.

7. Support Given to Equality in Nationality by United States, Prior to Montevideo Conference.

(A) *Internationally*—The United States had three times taken a stand internationally for equality in nationality, prior to its support of the Equal Nationality Treaty at Montevideo. These occasions were: In 1930, in a vote by the United States delegation at the World Conference on the Codification of International Law at The Hague; in 1931, in a letter from the Secretary of State to the League of Nations; in 1932, in a second letter from the Secretary of State to the League. The details are as follows:

World Conference for Codification of International Law, The Hague, March-April, 1930—The United States delegation, acting under instructions from the President, voted against a nationality

convention adopted by the Codification Conference, which convention discriminated against women. One of the grounds given by the Acting Secretary of State for the opposition of the United States delegation to the convention was that

"We do not in our laws make differences—or make few or relatively unimportant differences—as to rights of men and women in matters of nationality." (Statement issued by Acting Secretary of State, Washington, April 15, 1930.)

Letter from Secretary of State to League of Nations—The following year the Secretary of State, Mr. Stimson, in a letter dated June 23, 1931, replying to a League of Nations questionnaire, reaffirmed the opposition of the United States to The Hague Nationality Convention discriminating against women, stating:

"It is regretted that, because of the unsatisfactory provisions on two important points—expatriation and the nationality of married women—the Government of the United States was unable to sign the Convention on Nationality."

Second letter from Secretary of State to League of Nations—Again, on June 27, 1932, the Secretary of State, Mr. Stimson, sent a similar reply on behalf of the United States to another questionnaire from the League of Nations with regard to The Hague Nationality Convention, in which letter he again affirmed the adher-

ence of the United States to the principle of equality in nationality.

(B) *Nationally*—The United States had also taken a stand for equality in nationality at home, prior to the adoption of the Equal Rights Treaty at Montevideo, as follows:

In the Senate—The Senate voted unanimously on March 3, 1933, for the abolition of the remaining discriminations based on sex in the nationality laws of the United States. This measure did not become law, owing to the lack of time necessary for concurrence by the House of Representatives.

In the House of Representatives—The House of Representatives adopted the following resolution on May 21, 1930, introduced by Representative Hamilton Fish of New York:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States of America that there should be absolute equality for both sexes in nationality, and that in the treaties, law and practice of the United States relating to nationality there should be no distinction based on sex."

A bill to remove all remaining inequalities from the nationality laws of the United States was reported favorably by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House of Representatives on May 15, 1933, and is now pending before the House.

Press Comment

Hitler Would Not Have a Chance

Philadelphia Ledger, March 18, 1934.

EFFORTS of Mussolini and Hitler to discourage women from all activities other than home-making and motherhood would

have small success in this country, according to the observations of Philadelphia employment experts.

"In this city," explained Mrs. Claire Redmond, of the Federal-State Employment Bureau, "there has been no evidence of a back-to-the-home sentiment among women workers."

"Of course, if more women are going to work it will change the nature of home life. Nursery schools, which were originally for the working mothers in poorer sections, have spread by leaps and bounds. Naturally every woman has to work out her own individual problem."

"In some cases one mother is taking care of the children of several families, where wives find it necessary to earn money. Some women haven't had a dollar of their own for so long that the CWA work is a blessing to them, and many men have been so hard up that if their wives get a chance to work they forget their old scruples about woman's place in the home. Often the earnings of the women are the only source of family income."

"The question of whether or not a woman is married no longer arises in considering her qualifications for employment," said Mrs. Marian Pedraza, who is associated with Mrs. Redmond. "A few years ago it was always asked by prospective employers. Many other prejudices have disappeared or changed. Once employers objected to bobbed hair. Today it's red finger nails."

"Some few companies do not employ married women, but on the whole it is easier for a woman to get a job than it is for a man. One reason is that there are many more fields open to women today than in the past. Restaurants, institutions, laundries, employ a smaller percentage of men than of women. These industries are still busy because people must eat, sleep and wash."

"There is no question that women have replaced men in some jobs. They do certain skilled work better and will work for lower pay. As a result, women leaders have been fighting for unions in order to get the pay of men. Our department has made every effort to keep men employed, even if the rate had to be lowered, rather than put women in their jobs. We are not trying to put men out and replace them with women."

Franklin G. Connor, placement officer of CWA here and head of the Federal-

State Employment Service of Philadelphia County, saw no sympathy in this city with Hitler's attitude toward women in industry.

"As far as CWA work goes," he said, "Philadelphia has broken all records in creating jobs for women. This office has given a prestige to women's work that it has never had before. We make no differentiation according to sex, but are interested only in qualifications."

"Many women feel that if they are employed they can do more for their children. Invariably they can get some relative to help out at home. We are confident that the housekeepers' project, a new department, will take care of many unemployed women. This project will provide mothers' helpers, pre-natal care in destitute cases, improvement in sanitary conditions in the home and help in nursing the sick."

One story was told of a man who when offered work as a census taker asked that his wife be given the job instead.

"The poor woman hasn't been out of the house for months," he said. "We have had a sick child, no money and no recreation. I had one part-time job during the depression, but she has been bottled up for so long that she is sour on the world. I feel that if she could get out and see people she would be happier."

Men "Less Resistant" Than Women

New York
Evening Post,
March 2, 1934.

Rochester show that man is the weaker sex.

Dr. William J. Mayo learned years ago that, under certain circumstances and pertaining to certain diseases, the male of the species was less resistant than the female.

Using this information as a basis, Dr. E. V. Allen and associates of the clinic studied 300,000 cases by checking the findings.

"Many will take exception to this statement," Dr. Allen said. "They will say that football players, track men, wres-

ROCHESTER, MINN., March 2 (A.P.).—Here's something for the men to think about.

Facts and statistics on file at the Mayo Clinic at Ro-

tlers and those who excel in feats of strength and endurance are almost uniformly males. But physical prowess is but the outward habiliment of physical superiority. A quality much better reflected is ability to withstand disease."

The fact is, Dr. Allen said, that men are more frequently victims of diseases of the digestive tract, the lungs, kidneys and brain and functional diseases than are women.

He admits that women may be ill more frequently than men, but says their ailments are of lesser degree. Women are most commonly affected with nervous disorders and disease, and cases of varicose veins and heart ailments.

Among reasons for the "inferiority" of men, Dr. Allen lists overwork, alcoholism, "tobacco heart," industrial hazards and

irregular habits of sleeping and eating.

Virtually every community, he says, shows more widows than widowers.

The report shows that during the influenza epidemic several years ago more women than men were affected, but that the disease caused more male fatalities than female.

The Right To Preach

Associated Press,
March 4, 1934.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.—Women of the Methodist Episcopal Church South are drawing their lines to renew

the battle for one phase of equality that has escaped them—the right to preach.

The issue is expected to come before the twenty-fourth annual session of their missionary council.

News from the Field

Helen Brown Heads Business Women

HELEN ELIZABETH BROWN of Baltimore was elected Chairman of the Business and Professional Women's Council of the Maryland Branch of the Woman's Party at the last meeting of the Council, succeeding Ida I. Kloze. Other officers elected were: Annette Jurgens, Vice-Chairman; Grace Berger, Recording Secretary; Rose Zetzer, Corresponding Secretary; and Mary Bindok, Treasurer. May Walsh Payne was Chairman of the Nominating Committee.

Memorial Services for Marie Jenney Howe

MEMORIAL services for Marie Jenney Howe, noted Feminist and writer, were held at the home of Alice Duer Miller, 450 East 52nd street, New York City, at four o'clock, Sunday, March 25, under the sponsorship of various friends and co-workers of Mrs. Howe in her multifold activities. These friends and co-workers included the entire membership of "Heterodoxy," a club of women of widely divergent interests and commitments who first were drawn together in the bonds of friendship by Mrs. Howe twenty-two years ago.

Inez Haynes Irwin presided and among the speakers were Doris Stevens, Senator Robert M. La Follette. Mrs. Norman de R. Whitehouse, Alice Duer Miller, Mrs. James Lees Laidlaw, Fannie Hurst, Frances Maule, Ruth Hale, Floyd Dell, who talked on Mrs. Howe's contribution to American literature through her books on George Sand; David Seabury and Max Eastman.

At the close of the services, Mrs. Irwin read the concluding sentences of "A Prayer for Women" which had been written by Mrs. Howe: "May our sense of fellowship be deepened. May our sense of unity be strengthened until all petti-

ness and all vulgar selfishness shall fall away, and we stand together, true to our purpose, true to one another, as true to every woman as we are true to self. May each one of us enter the sacred places of her own high ideal and there make this prayer to her own over-self."

Mrs. Howe was the wife of Dr. Frederic

A CHALLENGE TO OTHER STATES

March 10, 1934.

Dear Mrs. Ogle:

It was, indeed, a gratifying surprise to realize that Pennsylvania is the winner of the Mary Winsor prize for Equal Rights subscriptions. Miss Winsor, no doubt, is happy to know that her State led in this way; and we rejoice that Pennsylvania can claim her and her beloved mother, the late Rebecca Winsor, as its own; would that every State could boast of similar honor.

I feel confident that our women will be impelled to strive again for leadership in this direction; not, of course, for the empty distinction of being a mere winner, but for the purpose of setting up a wholesome competition which will redound to wider circulation of Equal Rights.

Thank you for your warm, congratulatory letter, and believe me

Most sincerely yours,

Sara B. Cummings.

C. Howe, Consumers' Counsel of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. She died at her home, Shadow Edge, Harmon-on-Hudson, February 28.

Activities of the Texas Branch

LOLA MAVERICK LLOYD, Chairman of the Committee on International Relations of the National Woman's Party, was a recent speaker at various meetings arranged by the Texas Branch of the Woman's Party. Mrs. Lloyd spoke on the Equal Nationality Treaty before the Democratic Women's Club of San Antonio on February 14. She spoke, February 25,

before the San Antonio Business and Professional Women, giving them a full account of the Woman's Party work for equality. The meetings responded enthusiastically, and passed a resolution calling for the ratification of the Nationality Treaty adopted at Montevideo.

The Chairman of the Texas Branch of the Woman's Party is Rena Maverick Green of San Antonio, and the Congressional Chairman is Anne Carter of Georgetown.

One of the most active members of the State Committee is Mrs. Haygood Hendry of Beaumont. Mrs. Hendry has had a large number of meetings in the interest of the equal nationality bill in her District.

Clause for a Gift by Will to the National Woman's Party

Believing that women should have Equal Rights and opportunities with men before the law, in the professions, in industry, in education, in the church, in the home, and in the conduct of our Government, I give to the **National Woman's Party**, a corporation of Washington, D. C., the sum of.....dollars to further its work for the advancement of women.

Subscribe for **EQUAL RIGHTS**

\$2.00 a Year

19 West Chase Street Baltimore, Md

DAY PRINTING COMPANY PUBLICATIONS AND BOOKS

600 East Lombard Street
Baltimore, Md.